



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,226

02/02/2007

Takemasa Kawahara

F-9644

1822

28107 7590 12/06/2010
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP
122 EAST 42ND STREET
SUITE 4000
NEW YORK, NY 10168

EXAMINER

WELTER, RACHAEL E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1611

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/06/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/580,226	Applicant(s) KAWAHARA, TAKEMASA	
	Examiner RACHAEL E. WELTER	Art Unit 1611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 2-14 are newly added.

Acknowledgements

Receipt of the amendment and remarks/arguments filed on 9/17/10 is acknowledged.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. New claims 2-14 are appended to this rejection.

Claim 1 newly recites a first portion having a first degree of shrinkage and a second portion including a second degree of shrinkage, wherein said second degree of shrinkage is 2 to 20 times greater than said first degree of shrinkage.

Although applicant describes the design of the body sticking sheet and discloses drawings of the body sheets in the instant specification, applicant does not describe what material the body sheet is made of. More specifically, applicant does not describe what the portion with the first degree of shrinkage is made of and how it differs from the portion with a larger degree of shrinkage. Instead, applicant is merely describing the instant product in functional terms. As such, applicant has not shown to be in possession of the full scope of the claimed invention.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed.Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116. Applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Possession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was “ready for patenting” such as by the disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 119 S.Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641,

Art Unit: 1611

1647 (1998). Applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.

Applicant describes that two types of raw materials having different degrees of shrinkage are combined to form a portion with a first degree of shrinkage and a portion with a larger degree of shrinkage on pg. 6 of the specification. However, applicant does not explicitly describe these raw materials and what they are comprised of. The examiner acknowledges the newly added limitations of instant claim 1, wherein the second degree of shrinkage is 2 to 20 times greater than said first degree of shrinkage. Yet, applicant still does not describe how different the degrees of elasticity in each portion are from each other in instant claim 8. "A second degree of elasticity greater than said first degree of elasticity," is relative and does not convey meaning to the ordinary skilled artisan in assessing the scope of the invention.

As such, the claims lack adequate written description and do not reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that applicant had possession of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, new claims 7-14 do not comply with the written description requirement and introduce new matter into the patent application. Applicant recites in instant claim 7 that the adhesive of the body sheet should be on the contact side of each of said first and second portions. Additionally, applicant recites in instant claim 8

Art Unit: 1611

that the second portion has a greater elasticity than the first degree of elasticity of the first portion. However, the examiner cannot find support for such limitations in the specification and applicant's arguments fail to note where such support is found. See MPEP § 714.02 and § 2163.06 ("Applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure."). Although there is evidence of an adhesive on the body sticking sheet, the specification does not explicitly describe that the adhesive is on both the first and second portions. Also, elasticity is not recited in the instant specification and shrinkage and elasticity cannot be construed as the same thing. In order to have adequate support for the amended claims, applicant must prove that the specification explicitly states and/or exemplifies these limitations. Absent any such evidence, claims 7-14 introduce new matter into the patent application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that in light of the specification, it is apparent that one skilled in the art would be able to select a fabric with a desired degree of shrinkage and one with a lesser degree of shrinkage for use in a body sticking sheet. Applicant further argues that the test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation. Applicant argues that they are aware of no

Art Unit: 1611

requirement that the subject matter of a claim be limited to specific materials so long as the language describes the metes and bounds of the intended claimed subject matter.

In response to applicant's arguments, it is acknowledged that the specification makes some specific references to fabrics or cloth. However, the instant claims do not recite that the specific portions on the body sheet are made of fabric or cloth. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant has not described the two portions having specific degrees of shrinkage in a manner that would allow one skilled in the art to immediately envisage what they are made of.

Furthermore, regarding applicant's enablement arguments, it is noted that the written description requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement. *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 194 USPQ 470 (CCPA 1977), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 1064 (1978); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1562, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (While acknowledging that some of its cases concerning the written description requirement and the enablement requirement are confusing, the Federal Circuit reaffirmed that under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the written description requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement and gave an example thereof.).

As such, absent any definition of the first and second portions and what they are made of in the specification, it is the position of the examiner that the written description rejection should be maintained for the reasons stated above.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites a body sticking sheet with two portions wherein the second portion is comprised of a material that includes a second degree of elasticity greater than the first degree of elasticity on the first portion. "A second degree of elasticity greater than said first degree of elasticity," is relative and renders the claim indefinite. The limitation is not defined in the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Since applicant does not provide any standard for this limitation, it is difficult to compare the two different portions on the body sheet. Although the rejection of independent claim 1 is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment, "said second degree of shrinkage being 2 to 20 times greater than said first degree of shrinkage," claim 8 does not recite such a limitation.

Claim 1 also newly recites portions of the body sheet having degrees of shrinkage that are "contactably receivable to the affected area." Similarly, claim 8

Art Unit: 1611

recites, "adhesively receivable." However, it is not clear what applicant means by these limitations. Does applicant just mean sticking? Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-7 and 9-14 are rejected as being dependent on rejected base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The rejection of claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gordon (US Patent 3,329,143) is maintained.

Gordon teaches a shrinkable plastic bandage cover that is placed over a bandage or cast to protect the bandage from being contaminated by dirt, grease, liquids, etc. without undesirably constricting the bandage itself about the injured part which the bandage covers (column 1, lines 8-15; Figures 1-5). The bandage cover shrinks only when in a heated state.

The examiner is interpreting the bandage and bandage cover in Gordon to be the first portion applied to an affected area and the second portion with a large degree of shrinkage in claim 1 respectively. Since the bandage cover is highly shrinkable, it is implicit that the cover would have a degree of shrinkage 2 to 20 times greater than the bandage. Burden is on applicant to prove otherwise as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67,

Art Unit: 1611

205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980) since the examiner has no access to laboratory equipment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Gordon's plastic bandage cover is not expandable and contractible radially with centering on the bandage, nor is it contactably receivable to a portion of the body region surrounding the first portion.

In response to applicant's arguments, the examiner acknowledges that Gordon does not explicitly teach a bandage cover that is expandable and contractible radially with centering on the bandage. However, it is the examiner's position that such a limitation would be implicit since the reference teaches all the structural limitations of the claims. According to MPEP 2112.02, products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present as *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The scope of the instant claims is broad and therefore if the instant body sheet is truly different from the prior art, applicant must import structural limitations in the recited claims that distinguish them from the prior art (i.e., what the first and second portions are made of).

Art Unit: 1611

Regarding applicant's argument that Gordon's plastic bandage cover is not contactably receivable to a portion of the body region surrounding the first portion, the examiner acknowledges that Gordon's plastic bandage cover is placed on top of the bandage. However, it should be noted that the instant claim language does not exclude a second portion from being placed on top of the first portion in order to surround it. The features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As such, it is the examiner's position that the rejection should be maintained for the reasons stated above.

The rejection of claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 6339495 (See machine translation) is maintained.

JP' 495 teaches a gauze containing a sterilant or an antiseptic solution surrounded by a support member that may contract and extend in the direction of arrow (A') (see Figures 1-11 in non-translated patent; paragraphs 0006, 0009).

The examiner is interpreting the support member's expandable/contractible properties to indicate that it is shrinkable and elastic. Thus, it is implicit that the support member would have a large degree of shrinkage and elasticity relative to the gauze or padding and more specifically, a degree of shrinkage and elasticity 2 to 20 times greater than the bandage. Burden is on applicant to prove otherwise as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619

Art Unit: 1611

F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980) since the examiner has no access to laboratory equipment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that JP '495 fails to disclose "said second degree of shrinkage being 2 to 20 times greater than said first degree of shrinkage."

Although the examiner acknowledges that the reference does not explicitly teach such a limitation, it is the examiner's position that such a limitation would be implicit, especially since gauze would have less shrinkage than an expandable/contractible support member and the reference teaches all the structural limitations of the claims. According to MPEP 2112.02, products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present as *In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990)*. The scope of the instant claims is broad and therefore if the instant body sheet is truly different from the prior art, applicant must import structural limitations in the recited claims that distinguish them from the prior art (i.e., what the first and second portions are made of).

As such, it is the examiner's position that the rejection should be maintained for the reasons stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

New claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 6339495 (See machine translation)

The disclosure of JP '495 is discussed above.

Even though JP '495 teaches an adhesive on its second portion (support member); JP '495 does not explicitly teach an adhesive in its first portion (gauze).

However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to place some adhesive on at least the outer edges or border of the gauze in JP '495. One would have been motivated to do so in order to obtain better adhesion and security of the bandage.

Art Unit: 1611

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liguori (US Publication No. 2003/0023197). The rejection of new claim 6 is appended to this rejection.

Liguori teaches a shrink-wrap bandage adapted to accommodate characteristics of the target application or wound site, including the size, shape, and mobility thereof (abstract; paragraph 0002). In Figure 2, a bandage is taught which comprises a padding or gauze surrounded by shrinkable film and adhesives (paragraph 0041). Liguori also depicts square or rectangular shape bandages in its figures.

Since the bandage film is highly shrinkable, it is implicit that it would have a large degree of shrinkage relative to the gauze or padding and more specifically, a degree of shrinkage 2 to 20 times greater than the bandage. Burden is on applicant to prove otherwise as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980) since the examiner has no access to laboratory equipment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Ligouri fails to disclose "said second degree of shrinkage being 2 to 20 times greater than said first degree of shrinkage."

Although the examiner acknowledges that the reference does not explicitly teach such a limitation, it is the examiner's position that such a limitation would be implicit, especially since gauze would have less shrinkage than a shrinkable sheet strip and the reference teaches all the structural limitations of the claims. Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the prima facie case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. In re Best, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433. The scope of the instant claims is broad and therefore if the instant body sheet is truly different from the prior art, applicant must import structural limitations in the recited claims that distinguish them from the prior art (i.e., what the first and second portions are made of).

As such, it is the examiner's position that the rejection should be maintained for the reasons stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

New claims 3-5, 7-9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liguori (US Publication No. 2003/0023197).

The disclosure of Liguori is discussed above. Liguori also teaches that its bandages should be not limited to generally square or rectangular shapes but should also include other shapes such as circles, triangles, or other polygons (paragraph 0032).

Even though Liguori teaches an adhesive on its second portion (sheet strip); Liguori does not explicitly teach an adhesive in its first portion (gauze).

Art Unit: 1611

However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to place some adhesive on at least the outer edges or border of the gauze in Liguori. One would have been motivated to do so in order to obtain better adhesion and security of the bandage.

Furthermore, even though Liguori does not anticipate bandages with notches or bandages in the shapes of circles or triangles, it would have been obvious to make such bandages because Liguori suggests such bandage shapes as suitable alternatives. One would have been motivated to do so in order to accommodate a particular body part, such as a finger or toe.

New claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liguori (US Publication No. 2003/0023197) in view of Watanabe et al (US Patent No. 6,805,961).

The disclosure of Liguori is discussed above.

Liguori do not teach a first portion or gauze in a size of about 5 to 50 mm.

Watanabe et al teach an absorbent pad provided at a central region of an adhesive layer to obtain a first-aid adhesive tape (abstract). The gauze pad has a size of 12 mm x 20 mm and Watanabe et al teach that the size of the absorbent pad varies depending on the size of the medical adhesive tape or the like (column 10, lines 18-23; column 12, lines 37-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to make gauze within the instant size range of 5 to 50 mm.

Art Unit: 1611

One would have been motivated to do so since Watanabe et al teach that such gauze sizes are conventionally 12 x 20 mm in an adhesive tape. Furthermore, one would have been motivated to have such a gauze size depending on the size of the medical adhesive tape or the like.

Conclusion

Claims 1-14 are rejected. No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RACHAEL E. WELTER whose telephone number is (571) 270-5237. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau can be reached on 571-272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

REW

/David J Blanchard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643